

MINUTES

HARRISBURG PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING November 3, 2021

MEMBERS PRESENT: Joseph Alsberry, Chair
Vern McKissick, Vice Chair
Shaun E. O'Toole
Jamesetta Reed
Ausha Green

MEMBERS ABSENT: Anne Marek

STAFF PRESENT: Geoffrey Knight, Planning Director
Jacob Bowen, interim Deputy Planning Director
Isaac Gaylord, Deputy City Solicitor
Neil Grover, City Solicitor

CALL TO ORDER: 6:34 PM

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Commissioner McKissick moved, and Commissioner Reed seconded the motion, to approve the minutes from the October 6th meeting without corrections; the motion was adopted by a unanimous (5-0) vote.

OLD BUSINESS:

1 Lot Consolidation, Subdivision & Land Development Plan Application for the Atlas Building, zoned Commercial Neighborhood (CN), filed by Mighty Group Holdings, LLC, to consolidate thirteen parcels into five separate parcels for the purpose of redeveloping the existing building and vacant properties to establish office and commercial space and provide site and access improvements.

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the status of the project review, noting that the Planning Commission had vote to Table the application review at the previous month's meeting to grant the City time to review outstanding issues related to the site design, traffic impact study, and the on-site stormwater management. He noted that Planning Bureau staff and the City Engineer had met with the project team subsequent to the October HPC meeting and discussed the outstanding issues. Mr. Knight noted that the City Engineer had confirmed that the traffic impact study submitted by the Applicants was acceptable and addressed his concerns. He noted that the issues involved providing a permanent public access easement from the end of Elizabeth Street through Lot B to Jefferson Street, and reconstructing the sidewalk along North 6th Street, including the provision of bus stop furniture along the block which would be subject to approval from Capital Area Transit (CAT). Mr. Knight confirmed that Capital Region Water (CRW) had reviewed the revised documentation submitted for the project, and confirmed that most major issues were satisfactorily

addressed and that they were working with the project team to finalize their review of additional minor issues. He referred future discussion on outstanding issues to the Applicants.

The case was represented by Richard Gribble with By Design Consultants, Inc. (the project architect), 1950 Market Street, Camp Hill, PA 17011; and Andy Levine with Barry Isett & Associates, Inc. (the project engineer), 2 Market Plaza Way, Suite 7, Mechanicsburg, PA 17055 (aka “the Applicants”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicants whether the Applicants had anything to add to the information in the case report. They confirmed that they had met with City staff after the last HPC meeting to discuss the outstanding issues, and that they felt the conversation was productive and that they felt comfortable with the updated documentation. The Applicants stated that they had held a video conference with CRW to discuss stormwater management issues, and had redesigned the project to be in conformance with stormwater regulations, noting that they would be incorporating pervious pavers for some of the parking areas to reduce the amount of runoff.

Commissioner Alsberry stated that he had no questions or comments, reiterating concerns about traffic generation expressed at the last meeting, and noted that projects being considered or completed in the corridor would be asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner McKissick inquired as to the changes the Applicants had made to the proposal reviewed at the October HPC meeting. The Applicants confirmed that most of the changes were related to the configuration, development, and use of the parking areas on-site, noting that all of the lots except the existing parking area on-site (Lot A) would utilize pervious pavers.

The Applicants also confirmed that, based on discussions with Planning Bureau staff, the parking on-site would be phased in as the building became occupied; Lot A and Lot B would be constructed first, and Lot C and Lot D would be hardscaped, flexible space that could be used to accommodate the needs of businesses on-site or community events. Commissioner McKissick asked how they would be maintained until needed for parking; the Applicants confirmed that they would be developed with pervious pavers and could accommodate a variety of flexible uses besides parking.

Commissioner McKissick inquired as to zoning relief necessary for the project to move forward; Mr. Knight confirmed that the project would require Variance approvals to allow Lots B-D to be developed as “accessory parking lots,” since they would not be accessory to a principal use on the same lot. He noted that there may be Variances required for relief from Development Standards of the Zoning Code, based on the final site design, but noted that the usual requirement for exceeding the maximum impervious lot coverage would be obviated because they were using pervious pavers for the parking lot surface.

Commissioner Green stated that she was able to view the building in person to get a better understanding of the proposed site layout, and that she didn’t have any additional questions regarding the project.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against the project. Ms. Laura Harding (2246 North 3rd Street, Harrisburg, PA) stated that she had

consulted with an attorney and that the commissioners could not limit her comments on the project. She stated that the application was not complete due to the lack of an MBE/WBE engagement plan and information on the economic impact of the project. Ms. Harding stated that there were environmental concerns associated with the project, stating that there was illegal dumping occurring in relation to the project. She stated that there was going to be a meeting on Tuesday, November 9th at the Fair Housing Council building with the PA DEP to discuss the alleged issues. Ms. Harding stated that she had an email from the Harrisburg Housing Authority stating that they had not approved the dumping of construction debris on their lots (note: these are along the northern portion of the block along Forrest Street). She stated that the commissioners should not approve the project until the violations were addressed.

Ms. Joyce Vanderhorst-Gamble (2908 Parkside Lane, Harrisburg, PA) stated that she agreed with Ms. Harding and felt the project required additional consideration. She stated that the community had expressed concerns about the project at a Camp Curtin Neighbors United meeting. Commissioner Alsberry asked whether she was in favor of or against the project; Ms. Vanderhorst-Gamble stated that she was opposed to the project.

Commissioner McKissick moved, and Commissioner O'Toole seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (5-0).

NEW BUSINESS:

2 Variance Application for 1000 North Cameron Street, zoned Industrial (IND), filed by Rey Wenger with W.J. Strickler Signs, for relief from signage regulations within the Zoning Code to allow an additional wall sign on the property.

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the report, recommending Approval with Conditions; the conditions were that:

1. Any illumination of the proposed sign must conform to the Environmental Performance Standards in Section 7-331.9 of the Zoning Code so as to not create a nuisance, specifically to prevent light spillover onto whatever development arises on the property across Paxton Creek.

The case was represented by Chuck McCreery with Moran Logistics (the property owner), 601 Liberty Street, Watsonstown, PA 17777; and Ray Wenger with W.J. Strickler Signs (the contractor), 3999 Carlisle Pike, New Oxford, PA 17350 (aka "the Applicants").

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicants whether the conditions in the case report were acceptable; they confirmed that they were. He asked whether they had anything to add to the Planning Bureau's case report, and they stated that they did not.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner McKissick noted that his firm had designed the building and that they had intended for there to be substantial wall signage installed along various elevations. The Applicants noted that they had been operating in the space since July 2021, noting that it had previously been overflow warehouse space for the company's operation, and that as new customers were directed to the site, they had to have signage large enough to identify the building for new

employees, customers, and deliveries. The Applicant stated that they didn't want to end up having tractor trailers operating on surrounding streets and creating issues for surrounding properties and businesses. Commissioner McKissick stated that it made sense to be on the southern elevation as that is where a lot of freight traffic would be approaching the site.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against the project; there were no comments.

Commissioner McKissick moved, and Commissioner Green seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (5-0).

3 Special Exception Applications for 1428 Regina Street, zoned Residential Medium-Density (RM), filed by Gianni Cavero-Aponte with GCA Organization LLC, to establish a “Multifamily Dwelling” use on-site and request relief from the off-street parking requirements of the Zoning Code.

Mr. Knight noted that the Applicants were not in attendance, but that they had informally requested a Continuance until the January 2022 Planning Commission and Zoning Hearing Board meetings, per conversations with the Deputy Planning Director. Mr. Bowen confirmed that he had discussed the issue with the Applicant and that he was intending on submitting a formal Continuance request. He stated that the Applicant needed to provide a Lot Consolidation application to obviate additional zoning. Mr. Bowen stated that they were in the process of hiring a contractor to perform the necessary survey of the site. Mr. Bowen confirmed that the Applicant would need to submit a formal Continuance request to the Zoning Hearing Board prior to their November 15th meeting.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether the Planning Commission should vote on the Continuance request; Mr. Knight stated that he felt they should hold a vote on that issue. Mr. Gaylord stated that before taking a vote, the commissioners should hear any public comment.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against the project. Ms. Crystal Davis (1425 Regina Street, Harrisburg, PA) stated that she lived across the street from the project site, but that since the Applicant was not in attendance to answer any questions, she would wait to see when the review was rescheduled and would attend that meeting instead.

Commissioner McKissick moved, and Commissioner O'Toole seconded the motion, to Table the application until the January 2022 meeting. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (5-0).

4 Special Exception Application for 2463 Jefferson Street, zoned Institutional (INS), filed by David Peffley with D&F Realty, to establish a “Multifamily Dwelling” use on-site and to request relief from the off-street parking requirements of the Zoning Code.

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the report, recommending Approval with Conditions; the conditions were that:

1. The Applicant will submit a Lot Consolidation Plan prior to the Zoning Hearing Board meeting on November 15, 2021; if that documentation is not provided to the Planning Bureau by that

date, the Applicant will submit a continuance request to have the application review continued until the next scheduled Zoning Hearing Board meeting. Without a Lot Consolidation, the proposal necessitates a Variance for the primary use of 655 Schuylkill Street as an “accessory parking lot” and may require relief from aspects of the Development Standards as well.

2. If granted approval for the requested zoning relief, the Applicant will subsequently file a Land Development Plan and receive approval from the Planning Commission and City Council.
3. As noted in their proposed site plan, the Applicant will reconstruct or install new, ADA-compliant sidewalks along the frontages of all properties associated with the development. Additionally, the Applicant will ensure that the proposed curb curbs and parking area be elevated to the height of the surrounding sidewalks, so that vehicle access is treated as a driveway and not a through-street.
4. The Planning Bureau recommends that the Applicant install multiple bike racks (versus the proposed one bike rack) underneath the proposed exterior stairway addition, to help keep bikes out of the elements as much as possible and closer to the point of ingress/egress for residents of the upper floors.
5. The Applicant will coordinate with the Department of Public Works to confirm the appropriate size and location of refuse collection on-site, and update the billing accounts to reflect the new use.

Mr. Knight noted that while the City’s records did not show any residential units on-site, discussions with Codes Bureau staff confirmed that they had observed at least four units during previous inspections of the property.

The case was represented by Dale Hair with KD3 Design Studio (the project architect), 426 South 3rd Street, Suite 101, Lemoyne, PA 17043; and David Peffley with D&F Realty (the property owner), 700 Angenese Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110 (aka “the Applicants”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicant whether the conditions in the case report were acceptable; they requested additional information about two of the conditions. They noted that Condition #1 required the submittal of a Lot Consolidation Plan; Mr. Knight confirmed that was necessary to obviate zoning relief which would otherwise be required to have an “accessory parking lot” be the principal use on a parcel. The Applicants also noted that it might not be possible to locate the proposed bike racks until the egress stairway on the rear façade, due to building code restrictions; Mr. Knight stated that because the stairway would be enclosed, it might be a good way to shelter the racks, but stated that if the building code regulations prevented their installation at that location, he recommended they be installed as close to the landing of the egress stairway as possible, for the benefit of future tenants.

Commissioner Alsberry stated that his primary concern when reviewing projects of this nature was to ensure that there were a sufficient number of spaces to accommodate the demand for parking, and noted that the project seemed to have addressed that concern via the proposed accessory parking lot.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner McKissick agreed that the Applicants had reasonably addressed the

general concerns about parking, noting that the proposal provided more parking than many other similar proposals which had been reviewed by the commissioners.

Commissioner O'Toole stated that he agreed that the project would be an improvement.

Commissioner Green inquired about the cost of the proposed residential units on-site. The Applicants stated that they were intending on charging approximately \$700-800 per month. She asked whether the Applicants had conducted outreach to the surrounding residential community; they stated that they had not yet met with the community to discuss the project. Commissioner Green stated that community outreach was especially important when proposing new residential developments, but stated that she otherwise supported the project and noted that the development of more housing in the city was important.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against the project; there were no comments.

Commissioner O'Toole moved, and Commissioner Reed seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (5-0).

5 Special Exception Application for 305 Market Street, zoned Downtown Center (DC), filed by Nathan May with Mayson Management LLC, to establish a "BYOB Club" use on-site.

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the report, recommending Denial.

The case was represented by Nathan May with Mayson Management (the business proprietor), 660 West Vine Street, Lancaster, PA 17603 (aka "the Applicant").

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicant whether they wanted to respond to the Planning Bureau's recommendation of denial. He stated that, with respect to the references to his prior incidents with the Police, he had been in the hospitality business for ten years throughout southcentral Pennsylvania, operating approximately 300 events per year, and that he has only had two incidents with the police. He stated that they had never had any incidents in the thousands of events he had managed. The Applicant stated that he had 45 companies in his portfolio and that they could all testify to his integrity.

The Applicant stated that he had discussed his intentions for the business with Mr. Bowen, and that he didn't want to have a night club because he wanted to leave the space open for all kinds of events. He stated that he didn't understand what he was supposed to call the business besides an "event space," and that Mr. Bowen had told him it was classified as "BYOB club" and "night club" uses. The Applicant reiterated that he would categorize it as an "event space."

The Applicant stated Mr. Bowen's definition of operation a business was advertising the business and opening to the public, but that he felt it would only be if he opened the doors and had an "open" sign. He stated that he had admitted to Mr. Bowen that he had opened the building to people who were downtown, but that since it was a private building, he was allowed to open it to people that

he knew who were downtown. The Applicant stated that he only opened his building so that people could go there after going to other bars so that they didn't drive while intoxicated. He stated that there was then one instance where the Police showed up to the property to shut down the business, and that he was not operating that night because the Police were there. He stated that the incident did not occur at his property and, in fact, occurred at a building across the street, and that he didn't think it was an incident.

The Applicant stated that he was attending the meeting to know what exactly the building needed to do to be open for business; he said that he wanted to know what the building needed, but didn't realize that his past business operations would be relevant to the discussion. The Applicant said he would be happy to discuss conditions on the operation of the business.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether any of the commissioners had comments or concerns about the project. Commissioner O'Toole inquired as to what kind of business was being proposed. The Applicant stated that he initially wanted to operate an "event space" or a "members only club" but that there was no information on how that was defined. He stated that he asked Mr. Bowen for information on how to approach the Zoning Hearing Board with the proposal.

The Applicant stated that he had provided 3D images of the interior space, which was the size of approximately five shipping containers, to City Council members. He stated that it was the perfect space for an "event venue" which would be similar to other such uses around the community including La Cultura, but that there were no spaces for Black entertainment or urban development. He stated that he ran Black expos in Lancaster and that he wanted to do similar events in Harrisburg. The Applicant stated that he was going to use the space to run those events, but that he wasn't sure how the property would actually be run. He stated that he was going to have "sponsorships" come to the property to engage community and youth in various events, and that he wanted to understand how the property could accommodate those.

The Applicant stated that the concept of a "BYOB club" was based on discussions with Planning Bureau staff, who asked whether alcohol would be on-site, to which he stated that sometimes there would be alcohol and sometimes there wouldn't. He stated that there would be AA (Alcoholics Anonymous) meetings at the property, instead of being held in Steelton, and that there would be other events that involved children. He stated that he didn't think that type of use constituted a night club, despite Planning Bureau staff classifying it as such, because he didn't have a dance floor or a DJ booth.

Commissioner O'Toole asked what type of events would be held that did involve alcohol. The Applicant stated that it would be "nighttime events" after 10 PM, because children and older adults went to bed around then, and that events after 2:00 AM would be considered "after hour events" and would serve alcohol. Commissioner O'Toole stated that he was still unsure of what the business was; the Applicant stated that he was running a business that would "rent space by the hour," and that if someone was running a business after 2:00 AM, they would be required to have security, which his company could provide. He said the security guards were required as part of the liability agreement with the property owner, and to be prepared for violence that occurred on 2nd Street.

Commissioner Reed inquired as to what kind of events the Applicant operated in the city. He responded that he had been doing events in the Harrisburg area since 2011, with the first being at the Gingerbread Man on Market Street. He stated that he had operated “Pints” bar from 2019 until the COVID pandemic began [note: this was approximately March/April 2020], and that he had no incidents at that establishment during that time. The Applicant stated that he was the only bar that had residents from all over the city where no violence occurred, although stated that incidents did occur across the street. He stated that he talked to the community so that there were no surprises when they showed up to events.

The Applicant stated that he would be bringing the “Singer’s Lounge” from HMAc to his business, and also having karaoke nights, weddings, and other events. The Applicant stated that he was managing events with DJs and had been doing so at various venues in the city since 2010. He stated that he did pro bono work for business in the city, including at Arooga’s restaurant.

Commissioner Reed inquired as to the capacity of the building for the proposed after-hours activities; the Applicant stated that the building could accommodate 350-400 people, but that he capped the attendance at his events on-site at 100 people. The Applicant stated that because the use was not open for business, he did not have the financial capacity to provide security for the block of Blackberry Street behind the building. He stated that if an event was occurring during the day, then they would accommodate up to 400 people, who might be bringing alcohol with them.

Commissioner Green stated that she was curious to hear the public’s input on the proposal, and that the use described by the Applicant was different from what was presented in the case report. She stated that it sounded as though the Applicant was proposing a great event space, but also a 2:00-5:00 AM BYOB club; the Applicant affirmed that. Commissioner Green stated that she had never had a good experience at a “2-5” spot and that there were sometimes shootings and violence; she referenced two other such business on South 19th Street and Cameron Street. She said that it did not seem like a good use to be bringing downtown.

Commissioner Green stated that she was interested in reviewing a business plan for the proposed use and the activities that would occur on-site. She stated that she had attended events at Pints during the time of the Applicant’s ownership, and thus had a bit of an understanding of how his previous businesses operated. She reiterated that she wanted to better understand the proposed business, because it sounded as though the building might accommodate any kind of event. The Applicant stated that Black culture was making major strides and that he wanted to bring the type of events that were established in places like Atlanta, Houston, and North Carolina. He stated that bringing this type of business into Harrisburg was a “shot in the dark.”

The Applicant stated that an after-hours business was not something that he needed to do to make money, but that it was something people were looking for, because there were people who wanted to stay up past 2:00 AM when most other bars closed. He stated that he wouldn’t just let anybody into the building, and that he knew what to anticipate at the business because he knew what was going on in the community. The Applicant reiterated that he had 300 calendar events with no incidents of violence. He asked the commissioners what types of uses they thought were appropriate for the space, and stated that he would try to accommodate that.

Commissioner Green stated that she would be more comfortable with a better understanding of the types of activities and events that the Applicant proposed, and how they would be run; she noted that the commissioners would not be able to weigh in on the proposal once it got past their part of the review process. She stated that the commissioners were expected to take him on his word that he had run hundreds of events without any kind of incident. She noted that her only experience with his businesses was during her visits to Pints during his management; the Applicant inquired about her experiences at that establishment and she declined to answer. Commissioner Green noted that a business plan and background documentation would make her feel more comfortable, and that she would ask that of any applicant.

Commissioner Alsberry noted that there were a number of people in attendance regarding the current proposal, and asked that the public limit their comments to a couple minutes. He asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against the project. Ms. Jaqueline Barnet (the general counsel of Harrisburg University) stated that the organization was opposed to the proposal. She noted that they had invested millions of dollars in downtown Harrisburg for the purposes of retaining and recruiting students to the city. Ms. Barnet stated that the primary concern was a safe environment for students to learn and live; she noted that the business was directly adjacent to their dormitory housing. She stated that there were concerns about noise, trash, and drunkenness that would be associated with the proposed use.

Ms. Barnet asked that the letter she previously submitted be included with the case file, and summarized the points in it. She noted that college-age students were the group most statistically likely to be impacted by drinking, and noted that many of their students were not of drinking age. She expressed concerns with activities that already occurred on-site including occupancy despite the property being posted as uninhabitable. She also noted that during an incident on October 24th during which two individuals were shot in the rear of the property, including an individual who was serving as a bouncer for the business. Ms. Barnet reiterated that the University was concerned about the investments they had made in the community, and the health and safety of their students.

Ms. Barnet noted that every higher education institution must file an annual report called the Cleary Report that covered crime statistics within a geography surrounding the school. She stated that every crime would need to be included in the report, which was available to any current or prospective student, and that students would be making decisions based on those statistics. She stated that the two recent shootings would have to be reported, and would threaten the investments the school had made in the downtown area. Ms. Barnet stated that the proposed use would also have a negative impact on the economic development that the university brought to the city, including their Esport events, their annual concert series, as well as the impact of their students.

Mr. Pat Shaull (the Director of Safety and Risk Assessment with Harristown Corporation) stated that his organization worked with the Harrisburg Police to provide them with video of the shooting incident. He stated that they were concerned about the risk to their employees, noting that some worked around the clock and others lived in nearby housing, including one individual who was nearby during the incident. Mr. Shaull noted that the organization had unarmed security officers, and that he was concerned about their safety. He stated that he did not want to see gun violence impact his officers. He stated that he applauded the Applicant for his entrepreneurship, but that the

letters of opposition from surrounding businesses demonstrated that the use was not compatible with the neighborhood.

Mr. Anas Soubei (co-owner of Déjà Vu at 19½ North 4th Street, Harrisburg, PA) stated that he owned a similar business to the Applicant which was located nearby. He stated that it appeared there was a conflict of interest, with people trying to protect their own interests. He said that there were many bars operating along 2nd Street, and that people were shot in neighborhoods throughout the city all the time. Mr. Soubei stated that he wanted the Planning Commission to continue the case to a future meeting date, so that he could attend that meeting with legal counsel.

Ms. Ilham Driouich (co-owner of Déjà Vu at 19½ North 4th Street, Harrisburg, PA) stated that it sounded as though after-hour clubs had a bad stigma associated with them; she noted that she would likely be coming before the Planning Commission and Zoning Hearing Board as well to request permission for a similar use. She stated that Applicant might have had some incidents, but said that his business provided a place to sober up after 2:00 AM and also that some people liked to continue staying out after 2:00 AM. She stated that her business hadn't had issues, and that she felt Harrisburg needed more diversity in the entertainment options, and that it needed something different than the bars that were located along 2nd Street.

Mr. Cary Ellis (Harrisburg, PA) stated that their business had been running events in the city for a while, including weddings, graduation parties, and comedy routines, and that it was more than just the after-hours club. She stated that the business gave people the opportunity to chill after the bars closed, and that they weren't responsible for what occurred outside of the building. Ms. Ellis stated that it was possible to get shot anywhere, including along 2nd Street, and that people should be held responsible for their own actions. She stated that if the Applicant wanted to operate an after-hours, BYOB club, then they should be held responsible for what occurred there. Ms. Ellis stated that they could provide more information, and wanted to know what additional information the commissioners wanted them to provide, because their patrons needed somewhere to go after the bars on 2nd Street closed.

Nukeam Finley (2134 North 6th Street, Harrisburg, PA) stated that he came to support the Applicant because he attended his events. He stated that many locations on 2nd Street actually closed at 12:30 PM, but that there were often problems because there was no place for those individuals to sober up, which led to DUIs. Mr. Finley stated that he agreed with Commissioner Green that a business plan was necessary to better understand the nature of the business; he stated that because people were getting shot all over the city, individual businesses shouldn't be held responsible. Mr. Finley stated that the shooting referenced by Ms. Bennet was not near the front of the building, and thus could not be blamed on the Applicant's business; he stated that he knew because he was bouncing for an event that occurred that night. Mr. Finley stated that there was nowhere for people like him to go at night.

Mr. Robert Shoaff (1511 Green Street, Harrisburg, PA) stated that he was in support of the business and that he felt there was systematic racism working against the Applicant. He recommended that the Planning Commissioners read books on the emergence of Black culture in the south, and consider its message. He stated that he thought the Applicant's business could be a model for

individuals graduating from John Harris High School and the Sci-Tech School. He encouraged the Applicant to not give up and to continue pursuing his proposed business.

Ms. Laura Harding (2246 North 3rd Street, Harrisburg, PA) stated that she was also in support of the business, and that the Applicant often supported the Camp Curtin Neighbors United association. She stated that he helped people throughout the city. She stated that Ms. Bennet was “using statistics in a racist manner” and that she was extremely disappointed in them. Ms. Harding stated that she hoped that if the Police were concerned about businesses operating without alcohol permits, they should shut down the Harrisburg Beach Club because they were operating without a liquor license.

Mrs. Sheila Dow-Ford (2043 Bellevue Road, Harrisburg, PA) stated that this was the first she was hearing of the shooting incident, and encouraged everyone to calm down and try to appropriately balance the needs of town and gown. She stated that everyone had a right to be in the city, but stated that heated rhetoric would not resolve the issue. Mrs. Dow-Ford stated that as Black woman, she understood what it meant to be someone whose rights were not respected, but she also recognized the challenge before the Planning Commission. She stated that she helped found Harrisburg University, and noted that there was a need to balance the needs of the University against the needs of the larger community. She also supported Commissioner Green’s proposal to help the City officials better understand the nature of the business, and to allow more time to think about the best path forward.

Ms. Joyce Vanderhorst-Gamble (2908 Parkside Lane, Harrisburg, PA) noted that she was president of Camp Curtin Neighbors United, and stated that she was appalled that the Beach House and other places were allowed to operate without permits and licenses, while the Applicant had to jump through hoops. She stated that an event club for teenagers would reduce violence and that a space for people to sleep in the lounge would reduce DWIs. Ms. Vanderhorst-Gamble stated that people drag raced up and down Division Street and that the Police didn’t respond to a recent hit-and-run there. She stated that the Midtown neighborhood had a lot of crime, and nobody was doing anything about that.

Ms. Crystal Davis (1425 Regina Street, Harrisburg, PA) stated that she was in favor of the business. She stated that it seemed like the opposition to the business was that it would create crime, but stated that there was crime throughout the city and that it wasn’t just happening around clubs. She stated that there were a lot of bars on 2nd Street, and that it didn’t make sense to use the possibility of crime as a reason to oppose the proposed business. Ms. Davis stated that the Police needed to do a better job of stopping crime and catching criminals. She reiterated that she thought the prospect of crime was not a reason to deny the proposed business.

Mr. Grover stated that he was speaking on behalf of the City, and noted that many departments, including the Fire Bureau, Codes Bureau, Police Bureau, Tax & Enforcement Bureau, Planning Bureau, and Law Bureau, had all engaged the Applicant previously. He stated that if the proposed business was operated as presented by the Applicant at the meeting, there would be no issues, but that the City’s experience with the business was completely different. He noted that ads had been posted online regarding events occurring during the previous weekend, after water to the property had been shut off. He noted that there were no building permits or mercantile permits approved

for the property, and that having any alcohol on site required a liquor license or a BYOB license. Mr. Grover stated that if the Applicant was not willing to comply with the basics of operating a business, before getting approval from the Planning Commission or Zoning Hearing Board, then how could anyone expect him to follow the rules once approval was received.

There was a brief interruption and Commissioner Alsberry brought the meeting back into order. Mr. Grover stated that he had conveyed the concerns from the various departments to the Applicant's legal counsel. He stated that if the Applicant had a proposal for a different business than what had been operating on-site, then it would be viewed differently as a separate application. He noted that the Applicant had been "thumbing his nose" at the City's regulations. Mr. Grover stated that there was no issue with having a club, as they were located all over the city, but that the Applicant needed to do so in conformance with the City's regulations, which would make his patrons safer as well as surrounding residents. He noted that rules were in place for the safety and health the public and not to be hurdles. He stated that the City wasn't telling the Applicant that he couldn't run a business, but that he needed to do so in conformance with the public health and safety regulations.

Mr. Grover stated that he felt it was callous to claim that the Applicant had no responsibility for what happened outside the doors of his business. He stated that how the business was being operated and managed was important to what happened outside its doors, and that he felt the Applicant did not have credibility if they were making those statements. Mr. Grover stated that they had made inaccurate representations to Harrisburg officials and noted that the referenced shooting incident was not his first involvement with the Police and that the City had records on file related to past incidents at other clubs. The Applicant stated that he did not know Mr. Grover; Mr. Grover noted that he was right, but that he knew the Applicant based on the number of incidents that were submitted to his office.

Mr. Grover stated that the City rarely recommended denial for new businesses, and that the City wanted to promote new businesses, but that it was rare that all the departments involved in reviews had the same opinion on a business. He stated that this had become more prevalent since the COVID pandemic and noted that there were other similar businesses operating with similar issues throughout the city.

There was another interruption and Commissioner Alsberry brought the meeting back into order.

Ms. Elyse Irvis (17 26th Street, Harrisburg, PA) stated that she operated a business that was presented to the City and reviewed as a "studio pop-up shop" which had been open about three years. She noted that her business was approximately three blocks from Al's, at which a shooting had occurred, and that the Police had been called on her business five times because there were too many people of color gathered in one place. She stated that the Police had nothing to charge them with, but the neighbors would still complain about her business. Ms. Irvis stated that she had difficulty in establishing her business, and felt the City needed to be more open to the idea of new business concepts and that verbiage of the City's regulations was outdated. She stated that the City didn't understand the way she was describing her business, so her landlord had to speak on her behalf to get approval.

Ms. Irvis encouraged the City to update their regulations and Harrisburg University to become a partner to more Black businesses in their neighborhood. She said Harrisburg was a predominantly Black city and that the City should be doing more to support Black businesses and culture.

Commissioner Alsberry reminded the public that the Planning Commission was not City Council and that they heard testimony and voted on projects based on the regulations and requirements, and the merits of the proposal, and that it was not the place to air complaints about unrelated issues. He stated that the commissioners reviewed projects with respect to the requirements in the Zoning Code.

He asked the whether any of the commissioners wanted to make a motion. Commissioner Green moved, and Commissioner O'Toole seconded the motion, to Table the application review until the January 2022 HPC meeting so that the Applicant could provide a business plan and any related licenses to demonstrate that they could operate the business legitimately.

Mr. Gaylord noted that a continuance would mean that the MPC-mandated timeline would expire unless the Applicant agreed to a continuance request to the next Zoning Hearing Board meeting after the November ZHB meeting [note: in January 2022]. The Applicant stated that he was agreeable to a continuance.

Commissioner Green reiterated that she was proposing to Table the application review until the January 2022 HPC meeting. She stated that she expected the Applicant to provide a business plan, as well as any past dealings with the City and required permits. She stated that she was willing to meet with the Applicant and City staff after the meeting to better understand what was needed to reach an agreeable position.

Commissioner Green concurred that there were not a lot of places to go out late at night in Harrisburg, and that while she had gone out more when she was younger, there were less options now. She stated that having more event spaces would be a good thing, but that they had to be done by following the applicable rules and regulations, and not be operating outside of rules and regulations.

Commissioner Green stated that as a Black woman, she understood the challenges that existing conditions might present, but that it was important to navigate the same systems that everyone used. She stated that she had just reviewed her City Council account, and did not have any emails from the Applicant regarding their business, as the Applicant had indicated. She stated that as a City Councilmember and Planning Commissioner, she would have been a good point of contact to discuss the business and engage as an advocated. Commissioner Green noted that there were resources available in the City to help new businesses. She recommended that the Applicant utilized the available resources, and extended that recommendation to other applicants and potential applicants in attendance. Commissioner Green stated that the Applicant should provide information at the January 2022 HPC meeting demonstrating that they would be operating the business in the appropriate manner.

Commissioner Green moved, and Commissioner O'Toole seconded the motion, to Table the application review until the January 2022 HPC meeting so that the Applicant could provide a

business plan and any related licenses to demonstrate that they could operate the business legitimately. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (5-0).

6 Variance & Special Exception Applications for 2926 North 7th Street, zoned Commercial General (CG), filed by Jordan Garnett with Chasing Cash LLC, to request zoning relief to establish “Night Club or Dance Hall” and “BYOB Club” uses and for relief from aspects of the Specific Criteria for the “Night Club or Dance Hall” use.

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the report, recommending Approval with Conditions; the condition was that:

1. The Applicant will coordinate with the property owner of 700 Division Street to establish a formal parking agreement for the use of the excess available parking in their lot for however many spaces the Zoning Hearing Board deems reasonable.
2. If granted approval for the requested zoning relief, the Applicant will not allow non-emergency ingress and egress for patrons at the rear of the property to limit potential noise disturbances at dwelling units to the west.
3. The property owner should consider installing solid fencing and potentially landscaping to enclose the western portion of the property and to help buffer and screen the proposed use from properties to the west.
4. Any proposed signage related to the business must be in conformance with the standards in Chapter 7-325 of the Zoning Code; if not, the Applicant will secure the necessary zoning relief.
5. The Applicant will coordinate with the Department of Public Works to confirm the appropriate size and location of refuse collection on-site and update the billing accounts to reflect the new use.
6. The Applicant must conform to the provisions of Chapter 3-343 of the City Code related to noise control and abatement.
7. The Applicant must submit a Mercantile Permit and a BYOB Club Permit prior to commencing operations, which includes being in compliance with the requirements of Chapter 3-349 of the City Code.

The case was represented by Jordan Garnett with Chasing Cash, LLC (the business proprietor), 2311 North Front Street, Apartment 516, Harrisburg, PA 17110; and Sheila Bennett (the property owner), 2940 North 7th Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110 (aka “the Applicants”).

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Applicants whether the conditions in the case report were acceptable. The property owner stated that they purchased the property about six years ago but that they had been in the restaurant and bar business for over 25 years, stating that she had previously operated a bar at 621 Wiconisco Street prior to purchase the subject property and the adjacent property to the north at 2940 North 7th Street. She noted that she had operated a bar at that location for six years. The property owner stated that the building had been empty since the individual that previously ran a bingo hall on-site had passed away. The property owner confirmed that the owner of the proposed business had approached her with a proposal to operate an after-hours club from 2:00-5:00 AM.

Commissioner Alsberry thanked the property owner for the background information, but noted that he had inquired as to whether the conditions included in the case report were acceptable to the

Applicants; they responded that they did not understand all of the conditions. He noted that the Planning Bureau was recommending approval, but that it was conditioned upon the Applicants agreeing to additional stipulations; Mr. Knight explained the conditions to the Applicants. They confirmed that they were in the process of coordinating with the owner of the Uptown Plaza regarding a lease for spaces, but stated that there was ample on-street parking along the block of North 7th Street that abutted the property. The Applicants stated that they were aware of similar businesses located at other places, and noted that many of them did not have as much parking as they had, but stated that getting a formal lease from the owner of the Uptown Plaza might be challenging.

Commissioner Alsberry asked Planning Bureau staff to read through the conditions of approval again; Mr. Knight recited the conditions of approval and provided comments after each one. He noted that the Applicants were coordinating with the owners of the Uptown Plaza on parking, and confirmed that there was ample parking along North 7th Street that might be sufficient to meet the parking needs of the business; he stated that he had included that as a condition of approval as the Planning Commission and Zoning Hearing Board often requested such leases to ensure parking concerns were satisfactorily addressed. He noted that the conditions relating to access through the eastern entrance and installing a fence or plant screening would help to mitigate noise associated with the business. He noted that the conditions were only recommendatory, and that the Zoning Hearing Board would determine which conditions, if any, were associated with their approval.

Commissioner Alsberry summarized the case report, noting that the Planning Bureau felt that these would ensure that the business would be run in a way that did not disrupt the neighborhood, and stated that it sounded as though the conditions of approval were acceptable to the Applicants. They confirmed that they were.

Commissioner O'Toole asked the property owner whether she also owned and managed the adjacent bar, "Club S;" she confirmed that she did. He then asked whether she had previously operated a different bar, "Club S&D," and she confirmed that she had. Commissioner O'Toole confirmed that there was ample on-street parking along this block of North 7th Street.

Commissioner Green inquired as to hours of operation. The Applicants stated that while all their events may not run that long, they did want to ensure that the application acknowledged that some would run past 2:00 PM. The Applicants stated that they wanted to be up front and transparent about the business. Commissioner Green stated that she supported the proposal and was familiar with businesses run by the property owner. She also stated that the location of the business seemed to accommodate this type of business, noting that it would limit potential impacts on surrounding residents.

Commissioner Alsberry asked whether there was anyone from the public that was for or against the project. Ms. Crystal Davis (1425 Regina Street, Harrisburg, PA) noted that the adjacent bar at 2940 North 7th Street (owned by the same individual) had always operated in a respectful and quiet manner and stated that she supported the proposed business.

Commissioner O'Toole moved, and Commissioner Green seconded the motion, to Approve the request with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (5-0).

7 Variance Application for 1402 North 3rd Street, zoned Commercial Neighborhood (CN), filed by Sean Linder with SJL Rentals LLC, to convert the existing building into a five-unit “Multifamily Dwelling” on-site, which requires a Variance for exceeding the allowable density on-site.

Mr. Knight noted that the Applicant had formally requested a Continuance until the January 2022 Planning Commission and Zoning Hearing Board meetings, and that the documentation had been provided to the commissioners. He noted that the zoning relief request accompanied a Land Development Plan application, which required additional documentation until it could be considered by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Green moved, and Commissioner O’Toole seconded the motion, to Table the application until the January 2022 meeting. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (5-0).

OTHER BUSINESS:

1 Comprehensive Plan Update

Mr. Knight noted that he had spoken with Councilman Madsen and had inquired whether he had received proposed amendments from other councilmembers which might constitute a “substantive change” that would require an additional public hearing; Mr. Knight confirmed that no such submissions had been received, and thus that a final vote was planned for the Legislative Session on November 23rd. Commissioner Alsberry stated that he was happy to hear that the document would be receiving a final vote.

2 Subdivision & Land Development Ordinance regulations

Mr. Knight noted that due to the end-of-year workload in the Planning Bureau, he was not able to finalize the Planning Bureau’s proposed edits and revisions to the existing SALDO regulations in time for the distribution of the packets for the current meeting. He stated that he anticipated reviewing the SALDO regulations and providing initial comments and revision proposals in time for the January 2022 HPC meeting.

3 Request for the expansion of the Capital Area Neighbors (CAN) residential parking permit zone, from Angela Enos on behalf of the neighborhood group.

Mr. Knight noted that there was a final order of business which had not been included on the meeting agenda, specifically a request by a resident of South Street to increase the residential parking permit area in the Capital Area Neighbors parking district. He noted that they had made a presentation to the Parking Authority board, but that they also wanted to present to the Planning Commission as well.

Mrs. Angela Enos (323 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA) noted that she was accompanied by her husband, Mr. John Eno, on behalf of Capital Area Neighbors (CAN), and thanked the commissioners for allowing them to present. She noted that they had both been residents of the neighborhood for at least 16 years, and were particularly concerned about residential parking on

South Street. Mrs. Enos stated that she was representing various stakeholders, including residents of apartment buildings and ten rowhomes, including the Presbyterian Senior Living and BenMar apartments, as well as several businesses.

Mrs. Enos stated that the BenMar apartments had nineteen reserved spaces in an adjacent surface parking lot, and that each space cost \$175 a month, and noted that even if all were reserved for tenants, then 30 of the units would not have reserved spaces. She stated that approximately 64 individuals required on-street parking, and that each was eligible for a parking pass, but that there were only 39 on-street parking spaces for them. Mrs. Enos reiterated that she was speaking on behalf of all the affected residents.

Mrs. Enos stated that she sent a letter to the Mayor and Parking Authority in November 2020, outlining the difficulty in accessing on-street spaces. She stated that parking needs were changing as the city changed from a largely commercial downtown to a mixed-use one, and noted that while existing residents were used to dealing with the issue, residents of the recently-completed BenMar apartments that were parking on-street had made the situation untenable. She stated that residents of South Street were now forced to circle the block looking for parking, or park on Forster, Briggs, or Liberty Streets (which are also in the Zone 1 parking area). Mrs. Enos stated that residents of the senior living apartments often sat in their cars for hours or parked illegally since they weren't able to walk several blocks to their building. She noted that the situation was exacerbated during street cleaning days when parking was limited on one side of the street.

Mrs. Enos stated that she had a petition with signatures from 43 residents of the CAN Zone 1, as well as testimony from many residents which had been included in a packet provided to the commissioners. She reiterated that this documentation had been provided to the Mayor in November 2020, and noted that while an investigation into the issue had been initiated, there was no resolution.

Mrs. Enos stated that the issue had been renewed when, this summer, she was helping her daughter move into a building on the 1200 block of Penn Street, and had noted the ample residential parking in the neighborhood. She stated that she had reviewed a map of the residential parking zones in the city, and was dismayed to see how few were in the CAN Zone 1 compared to other neighborhoods; she referenced a series of maps she had brought showing these zones, and noted that there were less residential parking zones in CAN Zone 1 compared to other neighborhoods. Mrs. Enos acknowledged that while the other districts may be considered more "residential," the CAN Zone 1 district had seen an increase in the number of residential units, and thus required an attendant increase in the number of residential spaces. She highlighted the BenMar project, which converted vacant office space to residential units, as evidence of this change.

Mrs. Enos stated that in attempting to engage the City in increasing residential parking areas in CAN Zone 1, she had surveyed the BenMar apartment residents regarding their feelings on the issue. She noted that the residents of that project were experiencing the same issues that she was, and that they had provided testimonials regarding their frustrations; she noted further that these residents were considering not renewing their leases due to the difficulty in finding parking. She noted that the additional documentation had been provided to the Mayor's Office, the Harrisburg Parking Authority, and the Planning Bureau.

Mrs. Enos suggested that the Planning Commission support their request through a resolution, which could then be presented to City Council. She requested that the on-street parking along Pine Street, between Front Street and 2nd Street, be classified as CAN Zone 1 residential parking, which would allow BenMar residents to parking in front of their building, and free up on-street parking along South Street for residents of that block. Mrs. Enos noted that on-street parking was available on South Street between 5:00 PM on Saturday evening and 7:00 AM on Monday morning, which was enabled by residents of the BenMar apartment building being able to park on Pine Street and not be forced to park South Street.

Commissioner Alsberry asked if any of the commissioners had questions or comments. Commissioner McKissick noted that he had expressed similar sentiments during the commission's review of office-to-residential conversions downtown. He stated that the commissioners should be more critical of developers who testified that parking would not be a concern for their tenants, but noted that the primary consideration was the lease of the city's parking assets to a private operator, which removed the City's ability to effectively address these concerns. Commissioner McKissick stated that the commissioners may want to ask developers to pressure the operator into providing spaces for individual apartment buildings. He noted that downtown commercial office space was less necessary than it was previously, and that more residential conversions of this space may be necessary to keep downtown active, but stated that ensuring such redevelopments effectively addressed parking concerns should be a priority.

Commissioner O'Toole stated that the Parking Authority general counsel had stated that City Council had the authority to create or expand residential parking districts and that a councilmember should spearhead that effort. He stated that he thought some of the bigger developers downtown could help to fund the provision of residential parking within the existing parking facilities.

Commissioner McKissick noted that with the pending adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, the City could investigate whether things such as a "traffic impact fee" might be included for new development projects; he noted that previous developers implied that they would secure spaces in the City's garages to meet the needs of new tenants and, instead, had allowed their tenants to get residential permits and park on the street. He referenced bonds required for historic structure demolitions as a template for such a fee. Commissioner McKissick stated that the city needed more housing and a diversified downtown but that securing 30 or 40 spaces in the City's parking facilities to accommodate such proposals might be difficult.

Commissioner O'Toole stated that the current request was a bit unusual for the commissioners and noted that they were only an advisory body, but stated that he felt they could make a motion in support of the proposal. Mr. Gaylord noted that because the proposal had not formally been included on the meeting agenda, the commissioners shouldn't take a formal vote on the proposal. Commissioner McKissick stated that they could make a motion to put a formal resolution on the January 2022 meeting agenda.

Commissioner Green stated that she agreed with the other commissioners, and noted that the availability of on-street parking was an issue in neighborhoods throughout the city, although she noted that the current request differed in that there was already residentially-zoned parking that

was frustrated by the lease of the City's parking assets. She noted that converting metered parking to residential parking zones may require that the City pay for the use of such spaces, and asked whether such an action would extend to other neighborhoods within the area managed by the parking operator, which would defeat the purpose of the City's long-term lease of the parking facilities. Commissioner Green implied that it might establish a precarious precedent moving forward. She also noted that the issues in this neighborhood and others with parking permits should cause the City to evaluate the issue more closely, asking why there were more permits than parking spaces to begin with. She stated that she was willing to investigate the issue further and perhaps discuss it with the Law Bureau.

Commissioner Alsberry asked the Planning Bureau whether they had any thoughts on a proposed resolution. Mr. Knight stated that he wasn't sure whether the Parking Authority could pass a resolution that might hold equal weight to that of a resolution from the Planning Commission. He stated that the Planning Bureau was generally supportive of a focus on multimodalism and against paving real estate for surface parking.

Mr. Knight stated that development tradeoffs generally amounted to providing housing for cars versus housing for people, and that the Bureau would usually support the latter. He did note that the lack of a robust transit system within the city and surrounding region complicated such discussions because it wasn't feasible to ask residents to rely on the public transportation system due to Capital Area Transit's limitations. He noted that trying to plan for the "Harrisburg of tomorrow" while being considerate of existing residents and operating within the constraints of current conditions such as the Competing Parking Area, made considering tradeoffs more necessary. Mr. Knight stated that there was likely no silver bullet to addressing parking concerns in the city, and that it would likely take an "all of the above" approach to identify appropriate solutions.

Mr. Knight noted that the Planning Bureau had been discussing creative and alternative solutions to the issue of public parking with developers, including installing "shared streets" in areas where there was often not enough space for a lane of parking on one side of the street, much less both sides. He noted that raising the street to sidewalk level, and putting in visual cues such as chicanes or bump outs to slow traffic, would allow the full right-of-way to function as a required ADA-compliant path while allowing safe vehicular and pedestrian circulation. Mr. Knight noted that this approach was expensive, because it involved the reconstruction of infrastructure, but that it could certainly begin to address the issue at the margins and in neighborhoods throughout the city.

Mr. Knight stated that the city's pre-automotive grid was not meant to accommodate automobiles, and that they would need to approach the problem with innovative solutions tailored to the city. He noted that many of the solutions would likely require a public investment, which might lead to a requirement for exactions from developers, as noted by Commissioner McKissick. He stated that better management of right-of-way infrastructure might begin to address parking concerns while avoiding dedicating too much of the city's real estate to parking.

Commissioner McKissick noted that the Parking Authority had put together a parking analysis covering the issues of existing parking throughout neighborhoods, the number of residential parking permits issued, etc., and that the document could probably be shared with other

commissioners. He stated that the Parking Authority would likely make a recommendation to reevaluate the city's parking situation and make recommendations on how best to prepare for the future while accommodating the present, and agreed with Mr. Knight that paving properties throughout the city would be inadvisable. Commissioner McKissick noted that the reduction in on-site State workers should be considered, as should the long-term implications of companies moving to more remote-based work, which would reduce the need for parking that accommodated office uses.

Commissioner McKissick stated that he felt the Comprehensive Plan should be adopted first, after which the City could begin looking at long-term solutions to problems that fit within the general vision of the plan document.

Mr. Knight highlighted another solution to addressing the issue of residential parking, referencing a previous proposal he had discussed with members of the public at a workshop for the 2nd Street two-way conversion, in which existing surface lots of commercial and institutional properties along Front Street could be used for overnight public parking. He noted that these properties were often within or bordering residential neighborhoods, and that allowing overnight use by residents would best utilize the existing spaces within the city without needing to create more parking. He noted that studies often showed there were multiple spaces for each vehicle owned within a city, and that finding ways to maximize the utilization of such spaces should take precedence over creating new parking.

Commissioner McKissick noted that the adoption of new impervious surface limitations, both through the Zoning Code and as fees imposed by Capital Region Water, could incentivize the use of the existing lots to offset their cost. Mr. Knight concurred, and noted that the revenue generated by leasing existing parking lots could cover the increased costs imposed by stormwater management regulations.

Mr. Knight noted that the Planning Bureau always advised applicants coming before the Planning Commission and/or Zoning Hearing Board to consider the issue of parking, even if not required by zoning, because it would be raised during the meetings. He noted that it could be difficult for some applicants to address this, especially if they were a small business, but that finding more flexible approaches to the provision of parking would be beneficial to all parties involved. He agreed that a parking study might provide a variety of ways in which applicants could approach the provision of off-street parking for their proposals.

ADJOURNMENT: 8:55 PM

Commissioner McKissick moved, and Commissioner Green seconded the motion, to adjourn. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (5-0). The meeting adjourned at 8:55 PM.